

Condition of Roads, Ways, and Primitive Routes in Tuscarora Field Office
Wilderness Study Areas

Zachary Pratt, Ayla Anderson, Jeffrey Moore, and Blaine Potts

Bureau of Land Management
3900 East Idaho Street
Elko, NV 89801

February 1, 2013

Correspondence concerning this report should be addressed to Zachary Pratt, PhD, Bureau of Land Management, Tuscarora Field Office, 3900 E. Idaho St., Elko, NV 89801.

Telephone: 775.753.0212

Email: zpratt@blm.gov

ABSTRACT

Condition of Roads, Ways, and Primitive Routes in Tuscarora Field Office Wilderness Study Areas

The purpose was to examine (a) current soil and vegetation conditions of previously identified OHV routes, (b) to document the extent if any that the route's characteristics changed since being identified in the initial intensive inventory, and (c) to gather and document the current soil and vegetation condition of trespass routes and/or previously undocumented OHV routes in Tuscarora Field Office's six Wilderness Study Areas. Maps from 2002, drawn from CITRIX were used to identify routes in WSAs that were found during the 1979, initial inventory to use as a comparison to currently existing routes. At least four data points along the length of each route was taken using a Trimble GPS. At each of these data points, measurements were taken of the track depths along with photos up, down, left and right at the data point and were used to identify current conditions of the vegetation and routes for future reference. Depth measurements along with lengths of the routes were used to calculate cubic yards and tons of soil compacted/displaced in each WSA. Route soil and vegetation conditions varied from one WSA to another and even transitioned from one regime to another over the length of the route. In areas of pinyon-juniper there was very little vegetation in the route or understory. Across all of the WSAs 14 routes re-vegetated (disappeared) and 8 new trespass routes were identified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We have numerous people to thank for helping us with this research. First, we thank the members of the National Landscape Conservation System Internal Science Program Peer Review Committee for provided funding for this project. Next, we thank management of the Elko District and Tuscarora Field Office; Ken Miller, David Overcast, and Deb McFarlane for their support in accomplishing this project. Thanks to Barb Keleher, our Recreation State Office Lead for supporting and submitting our proposal through the Budget Planning System (BPS) on to the Washington Office selection committee. Erin Goergen and Julie McKnight of GBI for providing feedback and editing of the proposal as well as GBI Research Associates Ayla Anderson, Heather Granby, Andrew McDonald, and Steve Townley for collecting field data, correcting it, and entering it into CITRIX, thanks. Finally, special thanks go to our Geographic Information System Specialist Bruce Piper for working with us to develop and build the attribute tables, entering corporate data in Citrix, and keeping a sense of humor when we asked him repeatedly for help in using Citrix and the Trimble.

(The authors are solely responsible for any errors or omissions in this report).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	vii
Chapter I	
Introduction	1
Purpose of Study	2
Benefits	3
Definition of Terms	4
Assumptions	8
Limitations	9
Delimitations	10
Chapter II	
Literature Review	11
Policy and Guidance	11
Impacts of Roads and Ways	12
Description of Known Road Effects	14
Chapter III	
Methodology	16
Population & Sample	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	Page
Data Collection Protocol	17
Data Analysis	19
Project Deliverables	21
 Chapter IV	
Analysis & Results	22
Cedar Ridge WSA	24
Red Spring WSA	27
Rough Hills WSA	28
Little Humboldt River WSA	30
Owyhee Canyon	33
South Fork Owyhee River	33
 Chapter V	
Discussion and Recommendations	36
Discussion	36
Recommendations	39
References	184
Appendices	41
A Maps of Wilderness Study Area’s Inventoried Routes	42
B Cedar Ridge Wilderness Study Area Route Inventory: Data Point Photographs, Track Shape Graphs & Vegetation Analysis	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	Page
C Red Spring Wilderness Study Area Route Inventory: Data Point	
Photographs, Track Shape Graphs & Vegetation Analysis .	92
D Rough Hills Wilderness Study Area Route Inventory: Data Point	
Photographs, Track Shape Graphs & Vegetation Analysis .	103
E Little Humboldt River Wilderness Study Area Route Inventory:	
Data Point Photographs, Track Shape	
Graphs & Vegetation Analysis	109
F Route Data at Collection Points	138
G Forms	173
H Assorted Photos	176

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
<i>Table 1.</i> Cedar Ridge WSA soil displacement in cubic yards and tons . . .	25
<i>Table 2.</i> Red Spring WSA soil displacement in cubic yards and tons . . .	28
<i>Table 3.</i> Rough Hills WSA soil displacement in cubic yards and tons . . .	29
<i>Table 4.</i> Little Humboldt River WSA soil displacement in cubic yards and tons . . .	31
<i>Table 5.</i> Total WSA soil displacement in cubic yards and tons	34

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1.</i> Cedar Ridge WSA route 1 – point 4	23
<i>Figure 2.</i> Elko County District Map	43
<i>Figure 3.</i> Cedar Ridge Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	44
<i>Figure 4.</i> Cedar Ridge Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2002	45
<i>Figure 5.</i> Red Spring Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	46
<i>Figure 6.</i> Red Spring Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2002	47
<i>Figure 7.</i> Rough Hills Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	48
<i>Figure 8.</i> Rough Hills Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2002	49
<i>Figure 9.</i> Little Humboldt River Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	50
<i>Figure 10.</i> Little Humboldt River Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2002	51
<i>Figure 11.</i> South Fork Owyhee River Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	52
<i>Figure 12.</i> Owyhee Canyon Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2012	53
<i>Figure 13.</i> South Fork Owyhee River and Owyhee Canyon Wilderness Study Area Inventory Map 2002	54